

Attorney's Docket: 2002JP302Serial No.: 10/506,874Art Unit: 1762Response to First Office Action dated 04/28/2006**REMARKS**

The Office Action mailed April 28, 2006 has been carefully considered together with each of the references cited therein. The amendments and remarks presented herein are believed to be fully responsive to the Office Action. Accordingly, reconsideration of the present Application in view of the following remarks is respectfully requested.

Applicant has amended the application to attend to housekeeping and to protect what Applicant believes to be the invention. Applicant has amended the Title of the Invention to a title that more clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed.

Applicant has amended the Specification to properly capitalize trademarks where they appear in the Specification. It is noted that in paragraph [0040] the generic description is provided for each trademark, along with the supplier of the material.

In the claims, claims 1 and 7 were amended to more clearly recite that the undiluted solution is an aqueous solution with a pH..., and in claims 1, 7, and 8 the phrase "if necessary" was replaced with the phrase "optionally". Support for the amendment to claims 1, 7 and 8, may be found in originally filed claims 1 and 7 and 8, and in Applicant's Specification. It is believed that no new matter has been introduced by these amendments.

Claims 1-17 were rejected under 35 USC §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. The rejection of claim 1 under 35 USC §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention should be withdrawn in view of the above amendments which more clearly recite that the undiluted solution is an aqueous solution and that the addition of the antiseptic is an alternative. Anyone skilled in the art in view of the specification and the language of claim 1 which recite the requirement for a particular range of pH of 4.5 to 7.0 would clearly understand that the "undiluted solution" is a concentrated aqueous solution which would permit anyone skilled in the art to determine the metes and bounds of the invention. Claims 7 and 8 were similarly amended to more clearly recite that the undiluted solution is an aqueous solution having a pH from 4.5 to 7.0. Therefore, the rejection of claims 2-17 under 35

Attorney's Docket: 2002JP302Serial No.: 10/506,874Art Unit: 1762Response to First Office Action dated 04/28/2006

USC §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention should be withdrawn for the reasons given in support of claim 1 and in view of the above amendments which more clearly recite that which the Applicant regards as the invention.

It is respectfully submitted that, in view of the above remarks, the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112 should be withdrawn and that this application is in a condition for an allowance of all pending claims. Accordingly, favorable reconsideration and an allowance of all pending claims are courteously solicited.

Respectfully submitted,



Richard P. Silverman, Agent for Applicant

Registration No. 36,277

(CUSTOMER NUMBER 25,255)

CLARIANT CORPORATION
INDUSTRIAL PROPERTY DEPARTMENT
4000 Monroe Road
Charlotte, NC 28205
Phone (704) 331-7156
Fax (704) 331-7707